thermoplastic resin composition that exhibits improved stability under aging conditions of elevated heat and humidity.

Applicants submit that the comparative showing provided in Table 1 of the present application is sufficient to demonstrate the unexpectedly improved performance exhibited by compositions made according to applicants' claimed method and to thereby overcome any *prima facie* case that may have been made out by the examiner.

The composition of Example 1 falls within the scope of claim 9. The composition of Example A is analogous to that of Example 1, except that the composition of Example A contains only 4 wt% rubber and thus falls outside the scope of claim 9. Comparison of the Izod impact results after aging at 63°C and 100% relative humidity shows that the composition of Example 1 exhibited dramatically improved stability compared to that of the composition of Example A. The composition of Example 1 retained greater than 85% (9.8 ÷ 11.5)x 100) ≅ 85.2%) of its initial impact strength after aging for 28 days, while the impact strength of the composition of Example A fell to less than 25% (2.2 ÷ 10.9) x 100 ≅ 20.1%) of its initial value after 2 days of aging under the same conditions.

The composition of Example 2 falls within the scope of claim 10. The composition of Example B is analogous to that of Example 2, except that the composition of Example B contains only 3 wt% rubber and thus falls outside the scope of claim 10. Comparison of the Izod impact results after aging at 63°C and 100% relative humidity shows that the composition of Example 2 exhibited dramatically improved stability compared to that of the composition of Example B. The composition of Example 2 retained greater than 65% (8.9 ÷ 13.2)x 100) ≅ 67.4%) of its initial impact strength after aging for 28 days, while the impact strength of the

Applicants submit that the above-discussed comparative showing is sufficient to allow a conclusion that the method of the present invention provides improved stability compared to what one skilled in the art would have reasonably expected based on the combined disclosure of the references relied upon by the examiner, because applicant's comparative examples are each closer to applicants' claimed invention than are any of the compositions disclosed in any of the cited references.

For all the reason discussed above, applicants submit that the comparative showing is sufficient to patentably distinguish the present invention over the combined disclosure of the references relied upon by the examiner and request that the examiner now reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-7, 9 and 10 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Gosens et al., Yang et al. And Buysch et al. in view of the results of the comparison.

Conclusion

For the reasons discussed above, applicants submit that all claims remaining in the present application are in condition for allowance and applicants therefore request that the examiner now issue a *Notice of Allowance* for claims 1-7, 9 and 10 in the present application.

Respectfully submitted:

Kevin E. McVeigh
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 33,017
Telephone No. (413) 448-4730

GENERAL ELECTRIC CO
One Plastics Avenue
Pittsfield, MA 01201

_____, 1998